

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

- against -

ANDRE WILBURN,

Defendant.  
-----

**ORDER**

19-CR-108 (MKB)

MARGO K. BRODIE, United States District Judge:

On December 30, 2021, the Court “decline[d] to exercise its discretion to permit hybrid representation” of Defendant Andre Wilburn and “denie[d] without prejudice to later presentation through counsel [Mr.] Wilburn’s *pro se* motions: (1) asserting his right to [a] speedy trial; (2) objecting to the continuance granted on November 10, 2021 until January 21, 2022; and (3) for bail pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3164.” (Order dated Dec. 30, 2021 (“December 2021 Order”) 5, Docket Entry No. 60.) Since then, Defendant has made numerous similar motions,<sup>1</sup> and the Court has denied them for the reasons discussed in the December 2021 Order.<sup>2</sup> For the reasons discussed in the December 2021 Order, the Court denies Defendant’s recent motions asserting his right to a speedy trial, (Letter dated Feb. 28, 2022, Docket Entry No. 79), and to dismiss the Superseding Indictment, (Mot. to Dismiss, Docket Entry No. 81). However, the

---

<sup>1</sup> (See Mot. to Dismiss, Docket Entry No. 61; Mot. for Return of Property, Docket Entry No. 62; Letter dated Dec. 21, 2021, Docket Entry No. 63; Letter dated Dec. 23, 2021, Docket Entry No. 64; Suppl. Mot. to Dismiss, Docket Entry No. 65; Letter dated Jan. 4, 2022, Docket Entry No. 66; Letter dated Feb. 8, 2022; Docket Entry No. 76; Letter dated Feb. 4, 2022; Docket Entry No. 77.)

<sup>2</sup> (See Order dated Jan. 5, 2022; Order dated Jan. 10, 2022; Order dated Jan. 11, 2022; Order dated Jan. 13, 2022; Order dated Feb. 17, 2022.)

Court grants Defendant's counseled request for an extension until May 1, 2022, to file his suppression motion, (Letter Adjournment Request, Docket Entry No. 80), and also grants his request for free copies of certain transcripts, (Letter dated Mar. 3, 2022, Docket Entry No. 82). In addition, the Court directs Defendant to file all further motions through counsel. *See, e.g., Bennett v. United States*, No. 03-CV-1852, 2004 WL 2711064, at \*8 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 23, 2004) (“[The defendant] has submitted numerous *pro se* motions and letters although he is represented by counsel in the instant matter. . . . To alleviate further improper filings, multiple submissions and the resulting confusion, [the court] direct[s] [the defendant] to file all future papers through his attorney . . . . The [c]ourt will no longer accept [the defendant's] *pro se* submissions.”).

Dated: March 14, 2022  
Brooklyn, New York

SO ORDERED:

s/ MKB

---

MARGO K. BRODIE  
United States District Judge